REMARKS

Claims 1-56 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 24, 39, and 54-56 are independent claims. None of the claims have been amended in this response.

Claims 54-56 are allowed.

Claims 10-11, 14-21, 32-33, 35-36, 47-48 and 50-51 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 22-27, 30-31, 37-42, 45-46, and 52-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Chung et al.* (US Patent 6,470,389). Claims 5, 28 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chung* et al. (US Patent 6,470,389) in view of *Sollenberger et al.* (US Pub 20020152279). Applicant traverses these rejections. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Specifically, the cited art, alone or in combination, does not disclose the feature of "communicating the first network address followed by the second network address to the client based at least partially on a determination that the first site and the second site are available; and communicating the second network address to the client based at least partially on a determination that the first site is not available" as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 24 and 39.

Chung discloses a system for hosting a network service on a cluster of servers, each including a primary and a secondary Internet Protocol (IP) address. A common cluster address is assigned as the secondary address to each of the servers in the cluster, where client requests directed to the cluster address are dispatched such that only one of the servers of the cluster responds to a given client request (col. 4, lines 19-44). The dispatching may use a routing-based technique, in which all client requests directed to the cluster address are routed to a dispatcher connected to the local network of the server cluster. The dispatcher applies a hash function to the client IP address in order to select one of the servers to process the request. (col. 7, lines 12-37). The dispatching may alternatively use a broadcast-based technique, in which a router broadcasts client requests having the cluster address to all of the servers of the cluster over a local network. The servers then each provide a filtering routine, which may involve comparing a server identifier with a hash value generated from a client address, in order to ensure that only one server responds to each request broadcast by the router (col. 8, line 50 – col. 9, line 11).

The present claims recite that a domain name is received from a client at a first domain name server (DNS), while the second network address is associated with a second site that includes a *second domain name server.* Under this configuration, a system for multi-site clustering in a network is provided, where a domain name may be associated with multiple network addresses in the network, and a domain name server may be associated with each network address. The domain name server may monitor the web servers, load balancers, databases, and/or other components associated with the network address. A domain name server associated with one network address may also monitor the status of the domain name server associated with the other network address. When a client submits a request to one of the domain name servers for the network address of the domain name, the domain name server may communicate one, both, or none of the network addresses to the client, depending on the status of the components in the network

In contrast, *Chung* discloses a single DNS that handles all single and clustered IP communications to prevent interference (col. 7, lines 22-38). During normal communication, *Chung* teaches that, while each server is assigned a primary and secondary IP address, only a single IP address is communicated to the user at one time (col. 4, lines 3-8; col. 5, lines 1-7, 63-67). Also, when a server fails in *Chung*, a watchdog daemon corresponding to the server initiates a change of the dispatching function to mask the failure and rebalance the load. Under routing-based dispatching, the watchdog daemon may notify the dispatcher to change the dispatching function, while in broadcast-based dispatching, all servers may be notified to modify their filtering routines (col. 10, line 53-60). Accordingly, *Chung* merely teaches to either drop or filter out servers *within a cluster* (i.e. associated with a single IP address – see col. 11, lines 19-22). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is improper and should be withdrawn.

In light of the arguments provided above, Applicants further submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) must fall as well. Withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly requested.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as they presently stand are all in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner allow the claims and move the application to issue. However, if there are any remaining issues the Examiner is encouraged to call Applicant's attorney, Peter Zura at (312) 807-4208 in order to facilitate a speedy disposition of the present case.

If any additional fees are required in connection with this response they may be charged to deposit account no. 02-1818.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY _____

Peter Zura
Reg. No. 48,196
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: May 13, 2005